

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated November 16, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 16, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 30-58 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 33-36, 38, and 46-47 stand withdrawn by the Examiner. Claims 30-32, 37, 39-45, and 48-58 stand rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claim 30 has been amended to include an element from claim 32. Claims 39-41, and 56 are amended to clarify the invention. Claims 32, 44, and 55 are amended to correct matters of form. Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced in these amendments.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner indicated that IDS filed on 12/17/2004, 03/17/2005 and 05/16/2005 have been considered. However, based on the number and length of the references cited, a cursory review was made. The Examiner advised Applicant to provide a list of references that are most pertinent to the present invention if a detailed consideration is desired.

Applicant submits that among all the previously submitted references, the following reference is cited as a first reference by European Examiner:

EP 0,806,700

the following reference is cited as a first reference by German Examiner:

US 2002/0047838

the following references were cited in PCT International Search Report dated December 16, 2003 for the corresponding PCT patent application PCT/EP03/06481:

EP 0,806,700 A1

US 6,337,722 B1
US 5,774,100 A
US 6,380,729 B1
WO 98/31050 A1
US 6,340,963 B1
US 6,265,889 B1
US 5,657,139 A
US 5,930,607 A
US 6,320,568 B1.

Applicant submits that the above listed references are based on citations in PCT and foreign prosecution. However, Applicant does not to conclude that above listed references are more pertinent to the present invention than other references cited in the Information Disclosure Statements since Applicant has not studied all the references.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 30-31, 37, 39-40, 49, and 56-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Jenkins et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,437,596, hereafter *Jenkins*).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Jenkins teaches an apparatus for testing an array of pixel cells formed on a substrate (Abstract). *Jenkins* teaches data select control pads 29 and probe pads 23 connected to data line select/hold circuit 19 (Figure 1A, column 10 lines 23-48). However, *Jenkins* does not teach or suggest every element set forth in the rejected claims. Particularly, *Jenkins* does not teach or suggest a second arrangement of contact areas serves for pattern generation during test mode as set forth in amended claims 30 and 56, and claims dependent thereon. Additionally, it is unclear *Jenkins* teaches or suggest the data select control pads 29 are larger in size than the probe pads 23 from the schematic drawing Figure 1A.

Jenkins does not teach or suggest a drive electronics for driving an optoelectronic device with a matrix of picture elements, having a drive circuit, wherein the drive circuit comprises input terminals and output terminals, a first arrangement of contact areas connected with the input terminals of the drive circuit, and a second

arrangement of contact areas connected with the input terminals of the drive circuit directly or via another component, wherein the contact areas of the second arrangement of contact areas are larger than the contact areas of the first arrangement of contact areas, and the second arrangement of contact areas serves for pattern generation during test mode, as recited in amended claim 30, and claims 31, 37, 39-40, 49, and 57.

Jenkins also does not teach or suggest a method for manufacturing a drive electronics of an optoelectronic device having a matrix of picture elements comprising a) providing a drive circuit, b) connecting control lines of the matrix of picture elements with output terminals of the drive circuit, c) providing a first arrangement of contact areas, d) connecting the first arrangement of contact areas with input terminals of the drive circuit, e) providing a second arrangement of contact areas, said second arrangement of contact areas being larger than the contact areas of said first arrangement of contact areas, wherein said second arrangement of contact areas serve for pattern generation during test mode, and f) connecting the second arrangement of contact areas with input terminals of the drive circuit directly or via another component, as recited in amended claim 56.

Therefore, Claims 30-31, 37, 39-40, 49, and 56-57 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 32, 41-45, 48, 50-52, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jenkins* in view of *Matsuoka et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,453, hereafter *Matsuoka*).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Jenkins is discussed above.

Matsuoka teaches a LCD with a built-in driver (Abstract). *Matsuoka* teaches a test TFT 10 formed by a TFT of the same structure as in a display area 4 to determined quality of the TFT in the display area 4 (Column 2, lines 6-10).

However, the combination of *Jenkins* and *Matsuoka* does not teach or suggest every element set forth in the rejected claims. Particularly, the combination of *Jenkins*

and *Matsuoka* does not teach or suggest a second arrangement of contact areas serves for pattern generation during test mode, as set forth in claims 30 and 42, on which claims 32, 41, and 43-45 are dependent. The combination of *Jenkins* and *Matsuoka* does not teach or suggest providing an input signal of a drive circuit directly or via another component with input signals via an arrangement of test area to generate a test pattern on a matrix of picture elements, as set forth in claim 50, on which claims 51-52, and 55 are dependent.

The combination of *Jenkins* and *Matsuoka* does not teach or suggest a drive electronics for driving an optoelectronic device with a matrix of picture elements, having a drive circuit, wherein the drive circuit comprises input terminals and output terminals, a first arrangement of contact areas connected with the input terminals of the drive circuit, and a second arrangement of contact areas connected with the input terminals of the drive circuit directly or via another component, wherein the contact areas of the second arrangement of contact areas are larger than the contact areas of the first arrangement of contact areas, and the second arrangement of contact areas serves for pattern generation during test mode, as recited in amended claim 30, on which claim 32 is dependent.

The combination of *Jenkins* and *Matsuoka* also does not teach or suggest a method for testing an optoelectronic device comprising a) making contact between an external control and an arrangement of test contact areas which are larger than operational contact areas, b) providing an input terminal of a drive circuit directly or via another component with input signals via the arrangement of test contact areas to generate a test pattern on a matrix of picture elements, and c) testing the picture elements of the matrix of picture elements, as recited in claim 50 and claims dependent thereon.

Therefore, claims 32, 41-45, 48, 50-52, and 55 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 53 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jenkins* and *Matsuoka* as applied to claim 50, and further in view of *Henley* (U.S. Patent No. 5,432,461, hereafter *Henley*).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Jenkins and *Matsuoka* are discussed above. *Henley* teaches a testing apparatus having a light source and an electro-optical element to detect light radiated by the light source (Figure 1, column 3 line 55 – column 4 line 2). However, the combination of *Jenkins*, *Matsuoka*, and *Henley* does not teach or suggest providing an input signal of a drive circuit directly or via another component with input signals via an arrangement of test area to generate a test pattern on a matrix of picture elements, as set forth in claim 50, on which claim 53 is dependent.

The combination of *Jenkins*, *Matsuoka*, and *Henley* does not teach or suggest a method for testing an optoelectronic device comprising a) making contact between an external control and an arrangement of test contact areas which are larger than operational contact areas, b) providing an input terminal of a drive circuit directly or via another component with input signals via the arrangement of test contact areas to generate a test pattern on a matrix of picture elements, and c) testing the picture elements of the matrix of picture elements, as recited in claim 50, on which claim 53 is dependent.

Accordingly, claim 53 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 54 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jenkins* and *Matsuoka* as applied to claim 50, and further in view of *Kim* (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,927, hereafter *Kim*).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Jenkins and *Matsuoka* are discussed above. *Kim* teaches an LCD testing system. However, the combination of *Jenkins*, *Matsuoka*, and *Kim* does not teach or suggest providing an input signal of a drive circuit directly or via another component with input signals via an arrangement of test area to generate a test pattern on a matrix of picture elements, as set forth in claim 50, on which claim 54 is dependent.

The combination of *Jenkins*, *Matsuoka*, and *Kim* does not teach or suggest a method for testing an optoelectronic device comprising a) making contact between an external control and an arrangement of test contact areas which are larger than operational contact areas, b) providing an input terminal of a drive circuit directly or via

another component with input signals via the arrangement of test contact areas to generate a test pattern on a matrix of picture elements, and c) testing the picture elements of the matrix of picture elements, as recited in claim 50, on which claim 54 is dependent.

Accordingly, claim 54 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 58 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jenkins* in view of *Tomita* (U.S. Patent No. 6,924,875, hereafter *Tomita*).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Jenkins is discussed above. *Tomita* teaches an array substrate on which an OS inspection can be performed. However, the combination of *Jenkins* and *Tomita* does not teach or suggest a second arrangement of contact areas serves for pattern generation during test mode, as set forth in claim 30, on which claim 58 is dependent.

The combination of *Jenkins* and *Tomita* does not teach or suggest a drive electronics for driving an optoelectronic device with a matrix of picture elements, having a drive circuit, wherein the drive circuit comprises input terminals and output terminals, a first arrangement of contact areas connected with the input terminals of the drive circuit, and a second arrangement of contact areas connected with the input terminals of the drive circuit directly or via another component, wherein the contact areas of the second arrangement of contact areas are larger than the contact areas of the first arrangement of contact areas, and the second arrangement of contact areas serves for pattern generation during test mode, as recited in amended claim 30, on which claim 58 is dependent.

Accordingly, claim 58 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)